

the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was delayed on the first two votes this evening because of plane delay due to inclement weather in Cincinnati.

If I had been here on the Coburn amendment prohibiting the development or approval of any drug intended solely for the chemical inducement of abortion, I would have voted "yes."

On the Royce amendment, to reduce the total fiscal year 2001 agriculture appropriations by 1 percent, I would have voted "no."

CORRECTION TO CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JUNE 21, 2000, ROLL-CALL VOTE NUMBER 305

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 26, 2000, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of June 21, 2000, was ordered corrected to correctly reflect that Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD did not vote on rollcall number 305 (H.R. 4635/ on agreeing to the Collins of Georgia amendment). The electronic voting system had incorrectly attributed an "aye" vote to Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, many of us over the last several years have asked a very basic and fundamental question, and this question is going to be answered again this week, and that is: Is it right, is it fair that under our Tax Code 25 million married working couples pay on average \$1400 more in higher taxes just because they are married?

Is it right, is it fair that two people who joined together in holy matrimony, who both happen to work, are forced to pay higher taxes if they choose to get married? Today, the only way to avoid the marriage tax penalty if both the husband and wife work in the workforce is either choose not to get married or to get divorced. That is just wrong, that 25 million married

working couples, 50 million Americans, pay higher taxes just because they are married. It is wrong, I believe, and I know many in this House do believe that it is wrong, that we punish society's most basic institution, marriage, with higher taxes. That is just unfair.

Let me introduce to my colleagues Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two public school teachers, from Joliet, Illinois. Shad and Michelle chose to get married a couple of years ago. They are both in the workforce. They just had a child this past year, a new baby. They pay the average marriage tax penalty of \$1400. They knew that going into getting married, that they were going to pay more in taxes, but they chose to still get married.

I believe it is wrong. They pay \$1400 more in higher taxes. In Joliet, Illinois, which is a south suburban community southwest of Chicago, \$1400 for Shad and Michelle Hallihan, the average marriage tax penalty, is one year's tuition at Joliet Junior College, our local community college. It is 3 months of day care for their child. It is just wrong they have to pay more in taxes just because they are married.

Now, the marriage tax penalty comes into play when two people marry and they are both in the workforce and have two incomes, because under our Tax Code they file jointly, which means they combine their incomes. So in the case of Shad and Michelle, had they chose to stay single and just live together, they would each file as singles and they would each pay in the 15 percent tax bracket. But because they chose to get married, their combined income pushes them into the 28 percent tax bracket, so they get stuck with a higher tax bill just because they chose to get married.

Now, we believe in this House, and it is clearly one of the top agenda items for House Republicans, that we should bring about some tax fairness by eliminating the marriage tax penalty. I am proud that earlier this year every House Republican, and 48 Democrats who broke with their leadership, voted to wipe out the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples. Unfortunately, Senator DASCHLE and the Senate Democrats used parliamentary procedures to block action on that legislation, and we have now had to go through the budget process, or so-called reconciliation, which is a word few people know the meaning of, but it allows us to bring up a bill with a simple majority vote.

2130

With that ability, this week both the House and Senate are going to be voting on legislation which will wipe out the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples.

Now, some on the other side and AL GORE and a few others say, Well, let's give just a little bit of marriage tax relief so we can say we are for it. AL GORE says we should only give marriage tax relief to those who do not

itemize their taxes, those who use the standard deduction.

Well, we want to help those who do itemize, as well as those who do not itemize. If you think about it, most middle-class families, most middle-class couples, itemize their taxes because they are homeowners. Think about that. If you are a homeowner, those who oppose the bill we are going to be passing this week, because they do not want to help homeowners and they do not want to help those who itemize taxes, because they say they are rich, only rich people own homes today, according to AL GORE and other people.

Well, the bottom line is, the only way we can help Shad and Michelle Hallihan is if we pass the legislation we are going to pass this week, legislation that doubles the standard deduction for joint filers to twice that of singles, so we wipe out the marriage tax penalty for those who do not itemize, and then for those who do itemize, such as homeowners, or those who take the charitable deduction because they give to their institutions of faith or charity, we also widen the 15 percent bracket to twice that for joint filers to twice that of singles. That will eliminate essentially the marriage tax penalty for Shad and Michelle Hallihan.

Think about it. If we eliminate the marriage tax penalty, which we are going to vote this week to do, for 25 million married working couples, 50 million Americans, people like Shad and Michelle will have that extra \$1,400 to take care of their child. That is 3 months of daycare. It is a year's tuition at Joliet Junior College if they want to continue to improve their education.

I want to extend an invitation to my friends on the Democratic side to join with us. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty this week.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss for a few moments the legislation which we have been debating today and will take up again tomorrow in the U.S. House of Representatives. This is the agricultural appropriations bill.

I think many of us have rejoiced in the robust economy we have had here in the United States, but the sad fact is that farmers in America are not sharing in this robust economy. Instead, they are facing unprecedented low prices if you adjust for inflation. They are also looking at higher interest costs and increased fuel costs. This is a toxic cocktail that is going to take its toll on America's farmers as the year wears out.

So as we look at the agricultural appropriations bill, the question is, are